## **EXHIBIT 14**

1 (Case called)

THE COURT: Folks, I've pretty much made up my mind what we are going to do. But if anybody wants five minutes to address that issue in terms of what we are going to try first, I'll entertain it.

Suspense is killing all of you.

We are going to go with SKAT's modified trial 1 proposal. We are going to try the Markowitzes, the Merkensteijns, Mr. Klugman, and, subject to one contingency, Mr. Ben-Jacob on January 7.

Does that work for everybody?

I have also looked carefully at the proposed schedule for pretrial proceedings. I am going to make some changes. For one thing, my goal is not to maximize the paperwork, which it appears may have entered into this inadvertently or otherwise. I will start the schedule where you proposed to start it. I will compress it some. And you should have an order on that earlier next week.

Anything else we can usefully accomplish while we are all here?

Any chance of getting these cases settled? Where are we?

MR. MAGUIRE: If it please the Court, Bill Maguire for the plaintiff SKAT.

Your Honor, the door is always open to SKAT in terms

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McCARTHY: Understood. I was wondering if you are going to eliminate any of the things we want to make motions about. Because, if so, we would want to be heard.

THE COURT: I have not reached a final determination on that.

But the first thing that struck me has to do with the

not going to stop you, but it is going to accomplish -- in all likelihood, barring unforeseen circumstances or knowledge I

severance motion. If somebody wants to make that motion, I am

4 don't yet have, it's not likely to be terribly fruitful.

MS. McCARTHY: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: Wouldn't be the first case with defendants' positions in a multidefendant case being tried together. It just wouldn't. And it's manageable, I think.

MS. McCARTHY: The one thing, your Honor, I just wanted to bring to the Court's attention, I am sure the Court has been -- maybe not. But the Court may be aware that Mr. Shah is on trial right now in Denmark and --

THE COURT: To say the least.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.}}$  McCARTHY: He has testified and responded to the questions by SKAT.

Previous to his arrival in Denmark he had been in

Dubai which, as your Honor may know, is not a contracting party

to the Hague Convention, so we had no opportunity then to seek

his deposition when he was in Dubai. The parties would very

much like to consider whether or not to try to seek his

deposition between now and trial, given the changed

circumstances and the fact that he is speaking and has answered

questions, so appears not to be resting on his rights not to do

that.

Unfortunately, right now it's our understanding there

is no transcript of his testimony. We were just getting bits and pieces from press reports. But it would help us to determine whether or not we want to try to do that, and we understand we'd have to do it very quickly. If SKAT is able to provide any sort of summary that's been created about his testimony, that would be very useful to us.

THE COURT: I am not going to stop you right here and now. I want the case to move, but I'm not blind to the possible significance of testimony from Mr. Shah. I am a little puzzled about whether there is going to be a transcript, even if there isn't one at this moment and, if there were, how that might help or affect what we have to do here. I just wonder how the Danish courts deal with appeals and the like if they don't have a transcript. I know nothing about Danish procedure.

MS. McCARTHY: We will speak with counsel for the plaintiff to see if there is some way we can get a better sense of what he said on the witness stand other than what's in the press reports, and that would be, I think, helpful to our decision as a strategic matter whether or not we will seek the deposition.

THE COURT: Sure. Demonstrating my utter ignorance about Danish law, other than the one or two little pieces you have put in front of me over and over again, it's a similar law currently, right? So the questioning is not done by counsel,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

framework for deciding and understanding the facts that are being presented to them. We think that would be pretty useful for the jury and, frankly, pretty useful for the parties to know how those kind of key legal issues are going to get resolved before we present our evidence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25